| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4                | JEFFREY F. KELLER (148005)<br>JADE BUTMAN (235920)<br>KELLER GROVER LLP<br>425 Second Street, Suite 500<br>San Francisco, CA 94107<br>Telephone: (415) 543-1305<br>Facsimile: (415) 543-7861   |  |  |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <ul><li>5</li><li>6</li></ul>   | Attorneys for Plaintiffs David E. Lipton and Dana F. Thibedeau   |  |  |
| 7                               | IN THE UNITED STA  | ATES DISTRICT COURT  |  |
| 8                               | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |  |  |
| 9                               | SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION   |  |  |
| 10<br>11                        | DAVID E. LIPTON, DANA F. THIBEDEAU, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,   | ) Case No. C 05-2669 (MHP)   |  |
| 12<br>13                        | Plaintiffs,<br>v.  | <ul> <li>STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]</li> <li>ORDER TO STAY THE CASE</li> <li>MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE AND</li> <li>RELATED DEADLINES PENDING THE</li> </ul> |  |
| 14<br>15                        | INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation,  Defendant.   | <ul> <li>OUTCOME OF THE MOTION TO</li> <li>TRANSFER AND COORDINATE OR</li> <li>CONSOLIDATE PURSUANT TO</li> </ul>  |  |
| 16<br>17                        | Defendant.   | ) 28 U.S.C. § 1407<br>)  |  |
| 18<br>19                        | WHEREAS, on June 29, 2005, District of California ("Lipton Action");   | Plaintiffs filed the instant action in the Northern  |  |
| 20                              | ` <b>.</b>   | y Clerk's Notice the Linton Action was   |  |
| 21                              | WHEREAS, on July 7, 2005, by Clerk's Notice, the Lipton Action was reassigned from Magistrate Judge Elizabeth D. Laporte to District Judge Marilyn Hall Patel, all pending hearing dates were thus vacated, and a case management conference was scheduled for |  |  |
| 22                              |  |  |  |
| 23                              | Monday, October 31, 2005, at 4:00 p.m.;  |  |  |
| <ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul> | WHEREAS, on or about July 11, 2005, the plaintiffs in Brauch, et al. v. Intel  |  |  |
| 26                              | Corp., No. C 05-2743 (BZ) (N. D. Cal., filed July 5, 2005), a related matter, moved before the   |  |  |
| 27                              | Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation ("M  | IDL"), to transfer and coordinate or consolidate for   |  |
| 28                              |  | 1  |  |

## Cased 3065ccv002669JJJHP DoDommente39313 FField 10/20222066 Plagge22683

| 1        | pre-trial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 ("MDL Motion"), and the Lipton Action has |  |  |
|----------|--|--|--|
| 2        | been identified as a related action to that motion;  |  |  |
| 3        | WHEREAS, to date, a decision has not been rendered on the MDL Motion;                        |  |  |
| 4        | WHEREAS, the outcome of the MDL Motion will impact significantly the                         |  |  |
| 5        | schedule of this case;   |  |  |
| 6        | THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2                         |  |  |
| 7        | by and among counsel for Plaintiffs Lipton and Thibedeau, and counsel for Defendant Intel    |  |  |
| 8        | Corporation, that the case management conference currently scheduled for Monday, October 31, |  |  |
| 9        | 2003, should be stayed pending the outcome of the WIDE Wolfon,                               |  |  |
| 0        | IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED by the aforementioned parties that any events,                      |  |  |
| 1        | dates or deadlines set by the ADR Local Rules or Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26, |  |  |
| 12       | and any deadlines established in any case management order applicable to this case should    |  |  |
| 13       | likewise be stayed pending the outcome of the aforementioned MDL Motion; and                 |  |  |
| 14       | IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED by the aforementioned parties that if a case                        |  |  |
| 15       | management conference is rescheduled by the Court, the parties shan adjust the dates for the |  |  |
| 16       | conference, disclosures and report required by Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26    |  |  |
| 17<br>18 | accordingly.   |  |  |
| 19       |  |  |  |
| 20       | IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED.   |  |  |
| 21       | Dated: October 20, 2005  |  |  |
| 22       | Keller Grover LLP  |  |  |
| 23       | By: <u>/s/ Jeffrey F. Keller</u>   |  |  |
| 24       | JEFFREY F. KELLER  |  |  |
| 25       | Attorneys for Plaintiffs   |  |  |
| 26       | Lipton and Thibedeau   |  |  |
| 27       |  |  |  |
| 28       | 2  |  |  |

## Bingham McCutchen LLP 1 2 3 By: /s/ Joy Fuyuno 4 JOY K. FUYUNO 5 Attorneys for Defendant 6 **Intel Corporation** 7 8 9 [PROPOSED] ORDER TO STAY THE 10 CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE AND RELATED DEADLINES 11 The case management conference currently scheduled for Monday, October 31, 12 2005, is hereby stayed pending the outcome of the motion to transfer and coordinate or 13 consolidate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 ("MDL Motion"). Any deadlines set by the ADR 14 Local Rules or Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26, and any deadlines established in any 15 case management order applicable to this case are likewise stayed pending the outcome of the 16 aforementioned motion. 17 Upon the determination of the MDL Motion, if it is necessary for the Court to 18 reschedule a case management conference, the parties shall adjust the dates for the conference, 19 disclosures and report required by Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16 and 26 accordingly. 20 21 IT IS SO ORDERED. 22 23 Date: Honorable Marilyn H. Patel United States District Court Judge 24 25 26

Case of 3065 to 4002 168 9 JUNHAP Dobortom to 809 3137 Filled of 10/12/10/22/10/066 Plagge 30683

27

28